



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.								
10/825,865	04/16/2004	Edgar Hommann	34206/US	8185								
7590 David E. Bruhn, Esq. DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP Intellectual Property Department 50 South Sixth Street, Suite 1500 Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498		10/27/2008	<table border="1"><tr><td colspan="2">EXAMINER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">GILBERT, ANDREW M</td></tr><tr><td>ART UNIT</td><td>PAPER NUMBER</td></tr><tr><td colspan="2">3767</td></tr></table>		EXAMINER		GILBERT, ANDREW M		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	3767	
EXAMINER												
GILBERT, ANDREW M												
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER											
3767												
		<table border="1"><tr><td>MAIL DATE</td><td>DELIVERY MODE</td></tr><tr><td>10/27/2008</td><td>PAPER</td></tr></table>			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	10/27/2008	PAPER				
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE											
10/27/2008	PAPER											

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/825,865

Applicant(s)

HOMMANN ET AL.

Examiner

ANDREW M. GILBERT

Art Unit

3767

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ANDREW M. GILBERT.

(3) _____.

(2) Bridget Hayden.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: D' Antonio et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the prior art reference in view of the rejection and possible claim amendments to further differentiate the applicant's claimed invention. The Examiner suggested further structurally defining the housing of the injection device and the charging device and the connection between the two housings.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

(Andrew M Gilbert/
Examiner, Art Unit 3767